

ICDBG APPLICATION INFORMATION FORM

Applicant (City/County): City of Kooskia Chief Elected Official: Charlotte Schilling
Address: P.O. Box 126, Kooskia, Idaho 83539 Phone: (208) 926-4684

Sub recipient (if applicable): N/A Chief Elected Official: N/A
Address: N/A Phone: N/A

Application Prepared by: Progressive Engineering Group, Inc. Phone: (208) 746-5406
Address: 1208 Idaho Street, Lewiston, Idaho 83501

Architect/Engineer/Planner (Contact Name): Terry Nab, P.E. Phone: (208) 746-5406
Address: Same as Above

NATIONAL OBJECTIVE (MARK ONE)

☒ LMI Area ☐ LMI Clientele ☐ Imminent Threat
☐ LMI Jobs ☐ Slum & Blight

PROJECT TYPE (MARK ONE)

☒ Public Facility/ Housing ☐ Community Center
☐ Economic Development ☐ Senior Center

PROJECT POPULATION TO BENEFIT (PERSONS): (Census/Survey/Clients/Jobs)

TOTAL # TO BENEFIT: 675 TOTAL # LMI TO BENEFIT: 432
% LMI TO BENEFIT: 64% % MINORITY POPULATION: 9.0%

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project consists of distribution system improvements, aeration equipment for the water storage tank, and two (2) new fire hydrants.

| SOURCE | AMOUNT | DATE APPLICATION SUBMITTED | RESERVED/ CONDITIONAL AWARD | FUNDS COMMITTED/ CONTRACT AWARD DATE | DOCUMENTATION IN ATTACHMENTS ** |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| ICDBG | 352,000 | | | | |
| Local Loan * | 425,000 | | | Yes | Attachment B |
| City Cash | 18,500 | | | Yes | Attachment B |
| TOTAL PROJECT FINANCING | 795,500 | | | | |

* Identify Loan Source(s) Rural Development Date Bond Passed November 7, 2008

** Identify which appendix corresponding documentation is in. Documentation should be a letter from the appropriate source.

ECONOMIC ADVISORY COUNCIL PAGE

Project Description:

The proposed project consists of water improvements for the City of Kooskia, which are based upon a completed a Water System Study, approved by the Department of Environmental Quality, as follows: 1) 2,443 L.F. water main replacement on Esther Street, 2) 1,656 L.F. water main replacement on Front Street, 3) 2,232 L.F. water main replacement on Mill Street and Park Avenue, 4) 1,039 L.F. water main replacement on Highway 12 and Ping Street, 5) 1,339 L.F. water main replacement on West Street & Ping Street & Clearwater Street, 6) 800 L.F. water main replacement on Winter Avenue & West Street, 7) 977 L.F. water main replacement on Idaho Street, 8) 862 L.F. water main replacement on Depot Street, 9) 886 L.F. water main replacement on Thenon Street, 10) 1,036 L.F. water main replacement on Winter Avenue, 11) Aeration equipment for the water storage tank, and 12) two (2) new fire hydrants.

Water project consists of distribution system improvements to eliminate leaks, undersized pipes and hazardous materials

Water project will provide loops in the system to eliminate dead-end lines and poor water quality

Project Need:

The purpose and need of the project exists because the City has concerns about the adequacy of the existing water system to meet the existing and future needs of the City. The current source and storage for the City is very good, however, some water mains need to be replaced to eliminate numerous water leaks (6 leaks already within the first part of this year), old, undersized metal and asbestos pipe. In addition there are some areas of the water main system that are not looped and do not allow fire flow protection in areas of town, which does not provide system flexibility or sufficient water quality in dead-end water main lines and leaky deteriorating steel mains. And finally, there are some portions of the City that do not have adequate fire hydrant coverage that causes great concern during fire season.

Water project will provide adequate fire coverage to entire City including McFarland Pole Co. that currently on dead-end line with no fire flow

How the Need Will Be Addressed:

- The project will eliminate water line breaks and undersized and hazardous piping materials and remove steady maintenance disruptions
- The project will eliminate water quality issues due to dead-end water main lines and leaky deteriorating steel mains
- The project will add two new fire hydrants that will provide complete fire hydrant protection throughout the entire City
- The project will eliminate odor problems by providing an aeration system at the storage tank

Bond passed by 70% in November 2008.

Project Budget:

The City plans to secure \$352,000 ICDBG funds. ICDBG funding will be utilized for project administration (\$26,067), professional design and inspection services (\$129,300), and for 33% (\$196,633) of overall construction costs. The remaining funds (\$425,000) needed for the completion of the project will come from a bond that the City passed by a high percentage of 70% in November 2008.

City has already completed Environmental Report

The City has already spent \$18,500 in cash for project match, which was utilized to pay for the completed Water Study and the Environmental Review document.

THRESHOLD CRITERIA

A. Eligible Applicant:

The applicant is a city ☒ The applicant is a county ☐

If the applicant is sponsoring a sub-recipient or this is a joint application, describe the relationship and attach a draft agreement between the parties. Indicate if the sub-recipient is a faith-based organization.

This project does not involve a sub-recipient nor is this a joint application.

B. Eligible Activities:

List the eligible activities, identified in Chapter 2, that are a part of the project.

The eligible activities, identified in Chapter 2, that are a part of the project are as follows: 1) public facilities and improvements, and 2) administrative activities.

C. National Objective: There are six National Objectives listed below. Complete only the National Objective that will be met with the project.

C.1. Low-and-Moderate-Income Area Benefit:

Total number of households* in project benefit area_

***Note: For water and sewer projects, this is the number of households hooked onto the system and any households that will hook onto the system once the project is complete.**

LMI Percentage Determined by: (Check one and complete requested information)

| | |
|---|---|
| ___ Survey** (survey requirements in Chapter 3) | <u>X</u> Census (BG=Block Group) List the BG for each tract |
| Survey Report, Sample Survey, Survey | Tract___BG___BG___BG___BG___ |
| Tabulation, Boundary Map*** are found in: | Tract___BG___BG___BG___BG___ |
| | Tract___BG___BG___BG___BG___ |

** Survey methodology and documents must have prior approval from ICL staff

***Survey Area must match Project Benefit Area

C.2. Low-and-Moderate-Income Limited Clientele [Not Applicable](#)

C.3. Low-and-Moderate-Income Housing [Not Applicable](#)

C.4. Low-and-Moderate-Income Job Creation [Not Applicable](#)

C.5. Slum and Blight [Not Applicable](#)

C.6. Imminent Threat [Not Applicable](#)

D. Citizen Participation:

Describe the citizen involvement in selecting the project and reviewing the application. Describe compliance with the citizen participation plan and any other community plans.

The City of Kooskia completed a Water System Study in September 2007, which was approved by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in January 2008. The City worked diligently throughout the Study and bond processes to keep the public informed. In addition, the City has given project updates throughout to keep the residents informed. The following are activities completed to keep the public informed:

- Study Update Meetings with Kooskia and Consultant, September 2002 thru April 2008
- Kooskia Public Meeting Update, April 2008
- Project Update Meeting/Project Walk-Thru with Rural Development and Idaho Department of Commerce, September 2008
- Fact Sheet to Residents, September/October 2008

Kooskia adopted a Citizen Participation Plan on November 12, 2003. Please see Attachment E for Citizen Participation Documentation.

Date of Notice: October 30, 2008

Date of Hearing: November 12, 2008

E. Statewide Goals and Strategies:

Identify the goals and strategies that correspond to the project. Describe how the project meets the identified strategies and goal.

City of Kooskia's project will meet the following statewide goal and strategies:

Goal: Preserves and enhances suitable living environments

Strategies:

- Improve safety and livability of communities – this project will remove dead-end water mains, which will improve water quality and improve the safety and livability of City residents. The project will remove old steel and asbestos water main, which are hazardous. The project will eliminate odor and complaints thru the installation of aeration system at the City's storage tank. The project will improve fire coverage to the entire City by the addition of fire hydrants.
- Improve affordability and sustainability of quality facilities and services – this project will raise rates considerably, however, residents know that the rates will increase no matter what since the distribution improvements need to be completed in order to provide a sustainable water source and a good quality water source. The distribution system improvements will provide looping of the system, which will provide flexibility to the system that is not currently available. Specifically, **the McFarland Pole Co., which employs 7 people, will no longer be serviced from a dead-end water main, nor an undersized water main, and will have fire protection.**

F. Administrative Capacity:

1. Describe applicant's and sub-recipient's (if applicable) ability to manage the project as indicated in Part A. of this Chapter.
2. Identify steps taken or to be taken to procure a certified grant administrator.

City Administration:

The City of Kooskia has administered previous CDBG projects. The City is very familiar with the administrative duties required for CDBG and no findings have been found from previous monitoring on their past projects. The Council is comprised of five (5) Council Members and one (1) Mayor who are assisted by one (1) City Clerk-Treasurer.

Grant Administration:

The District has procured Progressive Engineering Group for grant administration. ICDBG Certified Grant Administrators Michelle Bly and Trina Dudgeon will administer this project. See Attachment D for Procurement Documentation.

G. Fair Housing:

For Public Facility/Housing and Downtown Revitalization projects submit Fair Housing documentation with addendum. For all other projects submit with application.

The City of Kooskia has adopted a Fair Housing Resolution, published the Resolution and completed an Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing and Action Plan as part of previous projects. See Attachment F for the Fair Housing Documentation.

PROGRAM INCOME

Describe if the project will generate program income and the reuse plan.

Not Applicable.

GENERAL PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Include the general project description as outlined in the narrative for this section. Be sure to address all the required details.

A. Community Description:

Describe the applicant's community by size, location, and economy as indicated in Part A of this Chapter.

See Attachment A for Idaho County Work Force Trends.

B. Community Needs Assessment:

Complete the chart below and provide a narrative to identify how all the community's needs have been assessed and how the proposed project is a priority in comparison to other community needs.

The following is specific to the City of Kooskia:

| Facilities & Infrastructure | Poor | Fair | Good | Not Applicable | Previously ICDBG funded |
|---------------------------------|------|------|------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Water | X | | | | |
| Sewer | | | X | | X |
| Electrical | | | X | | |
| Fire | X | | | | |
| Hospitals | | | | X | |
| Housing | | X | | | |
| Roads | | X | | | |
| Railroads | X | | | | |
| Airport | X | | | | |
| Broadband | X | | | | |
| Senior Center | | | | X | |
| Community Center | | X | | | |
| Community Recreation Facilities | | X | | | |
| Employment Opportunities | X | | | | |

Narrative: In the narrative explain why the project facility or infrastructure is in poor condition and how the project is a priority over the other facilities and infrastructures listed in poor condition.

The Public Works Supervisor made the above determinations. Water, fire, railroads, airport, broadband and employment opportunities were identified as being in poor condition. The water was identified to be in poor condition because sections of the water mains are old, deteriorating, undersized, leaking, and dead end mains do not provide fire protection or system flexibility to the City. Fire was determined to be in poor condition not because of the Fire Department but because of the fire flow problems in

the proposed project area. The City has a great volunteer Fire Department who has been proactive and very responsive to emergencies and obtaining latest technology equipment. The poor rating is established for fire due to the undersized line size, lack of looped water mains, and lack of fire hydrants to substantially provide coverage to the entire City.

Railroads were identified as being in poor condition because some rail lines that service Kooskia have been closed, the availability of rail service is poor, and the outlook for continued availability of rail service is poor. Broadband infrastructure was identified as being in poor condition. Broadband is currently being worked on because there is a big effort to push for broadband services; however, the problem is the topography and limited population base to share costs. The airport was considered being in poor condition because the airport that services the City is simply a grass runway. Finally, the employment opportunities were identified as poor because of the loss of logging, farming and support industries. There are a high number of retirees within the City of Kooskia because there is not a lot of opportunities for employment within the City and is getting worse due to mill closures.

Even though Kooskia's water infrastructure shares its poor condition status with other facilities and infrastructure, Kooskia ranks the water projects as the highest priority because the project is about health and safety issues, something that the City can control, and it is not just an economics and/or convenience issue.

C. Project Description:

Identify the specific components of the project that are to be completed. Identify which will be completed with grant funds and those that will be completed with other funding. This section should be detailed enough that it can be used to write a contract scope of work. Also include a site plan showing the boundaries of the project area and the existing infrastructure in comparison to the project improvements.

The proposed project consists of the following:

Water Distribution System Improvements to Increase Hydraulic Capacity, Improve Water Quality, Provide System Flexibility, and Provide Adequate Fire Flow Coverage:
(see Attachment G for Water Study Excerpts)

| Improvement Number | Description of Project | Project Need/Benefit |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Install 2,443 L.F. 6" PVC service main. | Existing service main is deteriorated and undersized ($\frac{3}{4}$ ", 1", 1-3/4", 2" and 4") and system loop is needed to improved fire flow and water quality. |
| 2 | Install 1,656 L.F. 6" PVC service main. | Existing 4" service main is deteriorated and undersized and system loop is needed to improve fire flow and water quality. |

| Improvement Number | Description of Project | Project Need/Benefit |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 3 | Install fire hydrant and 2,232 L.F. 6" PVC service main. | Existing service main is deteriorated and undersized (3/4", 1-1/4", 2", and 4") and a fire hydrant is needed to improve fire flow and water quality. |
| 4 | Install 1,039 L.F. 6" PVC service main and replace fire hydrant. | Existing 4" service main and fire hydrant are deteriorated and undersized and system loop is needed to improve fire flow and water quality. |
| 5 | Install 1,339 L.F. 6" PVC service main. | Existing 4" service main is deteriorated and undersized and system loop is needed to improve fire flow and water quality. |
| 6 | Install two fire hydrants and 800 L.F. 6" PVC service main. | Existing 2" service main is deteriorated and undersized and fire hydrants are needed to improve fire flow and water quality. |
| 7 | Install 977 L.F. 6" PVC service main, replace fire hydrant. | Existing 4" service main and fire hydrant are deteriorated and undersized and system loop is needed to improve fire flow and water quality. |
| 8 | Install 862 L.F. 6" service main and replace fire hydrant. | Needed to provide loop in system to improve fire flow and water quality. |
| 9 | Install 886 L.F. 6" PVC service main. | Existing 4" service main is deteriorated and undersized. Needed to improve fire flow and water quality. IMPACTS MCFARLAND POLE CO. |
| 10 | Install 1,036 L.F. 6" service main and replace existing fire hydrant. | Existing 4" service main and fire hydrant are deteriorated and undersized. Needed to improve fire flow and water quality. |

Installation of New Fire Hydrants:
(See Attachment G for Water Study Excerpts)

To meet fire demand requirements, 2 new hydrants will be required and will be installed with this project to provide adequate fire hydrant coverage throughout the City.

Project Funding:

The City plans to secure \$352,000 ICDBG funds. ICDBG funding will be utilized for all of the project administrative and design and inspection professional services and for thirty-nine percent (33%) of construction.

The remaining funds needed for the completion of the project will come from a bond that the City passed in November 2008. See Attachment G for Water Study Excerpts that identifies infrastructure improvement maps within the City/project area boundaries and the existing infrastructure in comparison to the project improvements.

D. Project Land & Permits: Answer the following questions and attach documentation.

1. Has any land, buildings, easements or right-of-ways been purchased for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No List Date of Purchase_____

What funds were used to make this purchase? _____ Not Applicable

2. Will any land, buildings, easements or right-of-ways be needed for this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Status of the purchase: _____ Not Applicable

3. Is anyone living on the land or in the structures at the proposed site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Is any business being conducted on the land or in the structures at the proposed site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

5. Are there any businesses, individuals, or farms being displaced as a result of this project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

6. Are there permits that will be needed for the project, i.e. well, water rights, land application, demolition permits, zoning permit, air quality permit, etc? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Status of the permits (include plan for securing permits): Upon completion of final design, design will be submitted to State of Idaho Department of Environmental Quality for approval

7. Describe the ownership or lease arrangements for the property involved in the project.

Improvements will be completed in the existing public right-of-way.

E. Imminent Threat Criteria:

Not Applicable.

BUDGET NARRATIVE

Describe the source and status of all funding for the project according to the instructions in Part A of this Chapter.

CDBG FUNDING:

The City of Kooskia pledges the following explanation for the CDBG dollars identified in the Project Budget:

Administrative (\$26,067) – prepare all written reports, checklists or legal notices required ensuring compliance with federal and state environmental requirements. Prepare a management plan and contract for review and approval by the Department of Commerce and other funding/regulatory agencies. Establish and maintain project files and prepare all documentation and reports required for administration of the grant. Review all proposed project expenditures to ensure their propriety and proper allocation to the project budget. Participate in the pre-bid and pre-construction conference and periodic construction progress meetings. Serve as the City's designated Labor Standards Officer and assure compliance with all applicable labor standards requirements. Ensure compliance with all applicable civil rights requirements, including preparation of an equal employment opportunity plan and a fair housing resolution. Attend City meetings to provide project status reports and represent the project at any other public meetings deemed necessary. Prepare all required performance reports and closeout documents and assist the City with determination of applicable audit requirements. Assist the City in complying with all the requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

Design Professional (\$129,300) – plan, design, and engineer construction project. Project design to include all structural, mechanical, electrical, and related systems. Prepare drawings, specifications and project cost estimates. Update cost estimates as necessary. Prepare bid documents in conformance with applicable federal and state requirements and applicable building codes. Supervise the bid advertising, conduct pre-bid meeting, issue addendum(s), prepare bid tabulation, assist in bid opening, and advise on award of bid. Advise on issuance of Award Notice and Notice to Proceed. Conduct the pre-construction conference and progress meetings. Consult with City regarding construction progress and quality. Perform onsite supervision of construction work, field staking, and prepare inspection reports. Review and approve all contractor requests for payment and submit approved requests to the City. Provide reproducible plan drawings to the City upon project completion. Conduct final inspection and testing. Submit certified "as-built" drawings to the City and the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality.

\$352,000 CDBG =

*\$ 26,067 +
\$129,300 +
\$196,633 +
\$352,000 =*

Administration =

*\$26,067 / \$352,000 =
7.4 % Admin. Costs*

*\$129,300 Engr. Design,
Const. Admin, Insp. =*

*\$ 25,000 Prelim. Design
\$ 35,650 Final Design
\$ 4,000 Bid/Negotiate
\$ 26,000 Construction
\$ 6,325 Post Construction
\$ 32,325 Inspection
\$129,300*

*\$129,300 / \$794,209
Total Project Costs =*

16.28% Engr. Costs

*The City of Kooskia
and consultants work
very hard to maintain
low engineering costs
and low administration
costs so that all the
needs are sure to be
met*

Construction (\$196,633) – construct distribution system improvements, install new fire hydrants, and install new tank aeration system to circulate water to remove “rotten egg” smell.

*\$196,633 / \$594,877 Total
Construction Costs =*

*33% CDBG Funds Towards
Construction Costs*

NON CDBG FUNDING:

In addition to the CDBG dollars identified above, the City of Kooskia pledges the following explanation for the remaining dollars identified in the Budget Form:

City Cash:

City Cash already spent for the project equals \$18,500, comprised of the following:

- Spent \$15,000 for Water Study
- Spent \$3,500 for Environmental Document

*The City of Kooskia has
already spent \$18,500
towards the project, which
completed the Approved
Water Study and the
Environmental Report*

Please see Attachment B for the City Commitment Letter.

Federal RD Loan:

The City held a bond election in November 2008. The bond passed with a respectable seventy percent (70%). The bond was for the amount of \$425,000.

Please see Attachment C for the Rural Development Commitment Letter.

IDAHO COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT BUDGET FORM

(Use only line items on pages V-7 & V-8)

Applicant or Grantee: City of Kooskia **Project Name:** Water Distribution System Improvements

| LINE ITEMS | ICDBG Cash | City Cash | City In-Kind | Federal* (RD Loan) | Federal* (RD Grant) | Private Cash | Private In-Kind | Total |
|---|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|
| Administrative** | 26,067 | | | | | | | 26,067 |
| Planning (Environmental) | | 3,500 | | | | | | 3,500 |
| Facility Plan (Water Study) | | 15,000 | | | | | | 15,000 |
| Design Professional (Design, Construction Administration, Inspection) | 129,300 | | | | | | | 129,300 |
| LMI Assessment | | | | | | | | |
| Construction | 196,633 | | | 398,244 | | | | 594,877 |
| Financing Expenses | | | | 10,000 | | | | 10,000 |
| Water Billing Software | | | | 7,500 | | | | 7,500 |
| Archaeological Report/Monitoring – N/A | | | | | | | | |
| Legal and Audit | | | | 7,965 | | | | 7,965 |
| TOTAL COSTS** | 352,000 | 18,500 | | 423,709 | | | | 794,209 |

*Identify funding source

**Administrative expenses and project planning design costs, when totaled, shall not exceed 10 percent of the total ICDBG amount.

DETAILED COST ANALYSIS

1. Have preliminary plans and specs been submitted to regulatory agencies for review?
Water Study ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, list date submitted: September 2007; DEQ Approval in January 2008

If no, list expected date to be submitted: Not Applicable
2. Has final design (for bidding) begun? ☐ Yes ☒ No
If yes, % complete: Not Applicable
If no, what is expected start date: May 2009
3. Will project include bid alternatives to meet project budget if necessary?
☒ Yes ☐ No
4. Are Davis Bacon wage rates applicable to the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No
If yes, are they included in the project costs? ☒ Yes ☐ No
5. Have known environmental measures been included in project costs? (ex: dust mitigation, archaeological survey, storm water drainage, wetland mitigation etc.)
☒ Yes ☐ No
6. What will expected construction contingency be at final design? 15%
7. List the last date the owner and design professional discussed project design and details.
Date: October 15, 2008
8. Design Professional Cost Estimate may be found in Attachment G.

Please see Attachment G for the Design Professional Cost Estimate and cost estimate excerpts from the completed and approved Water System Study.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

| Project Activity | Date (to be) Completed | Documentation in Attachments |
|--|------------------------|------------------------------|
| Design Professional Contract Executed | October 2008 | Attachment D |
| Grant Administration Contract Executed | October 2008 | Attachment D |
| Environmental Release | December 2008 | Attachment H |
| Other Funding Secured | November 2008 | Attachment B & C |
| Bid Document Approval | December 2009 | |
| Bid Opening | February 2010 | |
| Construction Contract Executed | March 2010 | |
| Start Construction | May 2010 | |
| Construction 50% Complete | August 2010 | |
| Second Public Hearing | September 2010 | |
| Construction 100% Complete | November 2010 | |
| Update Fair Housing Plan | June 2009 | |
| Update 504 Review and Transition Plan | June 2009 | |
| Certificate of Substantial Completion | November 2010 | |
| National Objective Documented | November 2008 (Census) | |
| Final Closeout | December 2010 | |
| Final Audit | December 2011 | |

| Name of Professional and Agency Contacts | Firm/Agency | Phone | Contact |
|--|--|---------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Accountant | Presnell Gage | (208) 746-8281 | Mitchell Marx |
| Attorney | Dee, MacGregor, Fales & MacGregor | (208) 983-0250 | Kirk MacGregor |
| Bond Counsel | KL Gates | (509) 999-6919 | Mike Ormsby |
| Chief Elected Official | City of Kooskia | (208) 926-4684 | Charlotte Schilling |
| Clerk - Treasurer | City of Kooskia | (208) 926-4684 | Teresa Lytle |
| Design Professional | Progressive Engineering | (208) 746-5406 | Terry Nab, P.E. |
| Environmental Officer | Progressive Engineering | (208) 746-5406 | Michelle Bly, P.C.E.D. |
| Fire Chief | City of Kooskia | (208) 926-4684 | Mark Anderson |
| Funding Agency | Idaho Department of Commerce | (208) 334-2650, ext. 2111 | Tony Tenne |
| Funding Agency | Rural Development | (208) 762-4939 ext. 119 | Ted Anderson |
| Grant Administration | Progressive Engineering | (208) 746-5406 | Michelle Bly Trina Dudgeon |
| Public Works Supervisor | City of Kooskia | (208) 926-4684 | Kelly Frazier |
| Regulatory Compliance | State of Idaho Department of Environmental Quality | (208) 799-4370 | Tom Moore, P.E. |

GRANTEE AND SUB-RECIPIENT FINANCIAL PROFILES

Is the Grantee a (circle one)

City

County

If a sub-recipient, what type of Organization (circle one) **Not Applicable**

Water & Sewer District

Homeowner's Association

For-Profit Company

Non-Profit Company

Water Association

Fire District

Hospital District

Other (please explain):

**INSTRUCTIONS

For all projects complete Sections III & IV

For all projects that pertain to water complete Section I, III, & IV.

For all projects that pertain to sewer complete Section II, III & IV.

Section I. Water System (only):

Input information for the water system (entity) that is expected to utilize the Idaho Community Block Grant funds.

Water Source(s):

☒ Wells

☐ River

☐ Lake

☐ Springs

☐ Purchase

☐ Other

Water Treatment Method: Chlorine

See Attachment I for Summary of Project Users & Utility Rate Schedule:

| | |
|---|-----------------|
| Number of people served by the system | 675 |
| Number of hook-ups on the system | 337 |
| Number of equivalent dwelling units (EDU's) on the system | 381 |
| Number of residential EDUs (single & multi-family) | 334 |
| Number of commercial EDUs (small, large & public buildings) | 47 |
| Number of industrial EDUs | 0 |
| Number of Wells | 4 |
| Number of Fire Hydrants | 49 |
| Storage Reservoir (gallons) | 324,859 |
| Water piping (linear feet) | 50,126 |
| Are all system users on meters | Yes |
| Are meters consistently read | Yes |
| For users, what is the average monthly * | \$ 17.00 * |
| Water rate for 10,000 gallons | |
| When was the last rate increase | October 1, 2008 |
| How much were the rates increased | 4.9% |

* **The City has planned to incrementally increase their water rates \$7 to \$10 over the next two (2) years in order to pay for the water project bond.**

Annual Water System Revenue:

Current funds in capitol improvement account

Current funds in reserve fund – **Debt Reserve**

Total dollar amount owed by customers in arrears

| | |
|----|---------------|
| \$ | <u>87,853</u> |
| \$ | <u>58,232</u> |
| \$ | <u>13,707</u> |

Annual Water System Expenses (Excluding Depreciation):

Residential Hook-Up Fee

Commercial Hook-up Fee

Industrial Hook-Up Fee

| |
|---|
| Cost of Materials and Labor = \$500 Minimum |
|---|

| | |
|----|---------------|
| \$ | <u>77,569</u> |
| \$ | <u>---</u> |
| \$ | <u>---</u> |
| \$ | <u>---</u> |

Value and Description of Assets (water only):

Land

Buildings

Equipment

Other System**Total Asset Value:**

| | |
|----|-----------------------------|
| \$ | <u> </u> |
| \$ | <u> </u> |
| \$ | <u> </u> |
| \$ | <u>1,367,382</u> |
| \$ | <u>1,367,382</u> |

Identify Outstanding Indebtedness:

Years Remaining

Annual Payment

Lender

24 (2030)21,716USDA Farm Home Admin – Water06 (2012)14,044USDA Farm Home Admin – Sewer29 (2037)7,928USDA Farm Home Admin – WWTPExplain Water Conservation Methods Implemented: Monitor water usage**Section II. Sewer System (only):**Input information for the sewer system (entity) that is expected to utilize the Idaho Community Block Grant funds. **(Not Applicable)****Section III. All Applications:**A. Identify how the organization obtains its operating funding, i.e. bonds, district assessments, other: Kooskia obtains its operating funding strictly from patron usage of water.B. Does the organization have taxing authority? ☒ Yes ☐ No (if no, skip to Section IV)1. Do you tax? ☒ Yes ☐ No

a) If yes:

(1) What is the tax rate? Varies by Fund(2) What is the annual tax amount generated? 67,487(3) What are the taxes used to pay for, i.e. equipment, operating expenses, etc.? Governmental Fund Operations2. If your organization does not tax explain why. N/A

Section IV. Grantee (City or County) Profile:

Financial summary based on most current audit report.

Revenue (Governmental Funds Only):

| | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|
| Taxes | \$ 67,487 |
| Licenses and Permits | \$ 1,558 |
| Intergovernmental | \$ 263,905 |
| Charges for Services | \$ 5,940 |
| Miscellaneous | \$ 17,651 |
| Fines & Penalties | \$ |
| Other Income | \$ 5,048 |
| Total Annual Revenue: | \$ 361,589 |

Expenses:

| | |
|---------------------------|------------|
| Total Annual Expenditures | \$ 370,655 |
|---------------------------|------------|

Growth Management Planning:When was the comprehensive plan last updated? July 2008

Which of the following tools do you implement as land use measures and controls?

| | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| Floodplain & Setback Requirements | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| Building Codes | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| Historical Preservation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
| (Have Applied for Preserving America Status) | | | |
| Conventional Zoning Ordinances | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |

Other Zoning Options (see below):

| | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Bonus or Incentive Zoning | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|

Example: allows for increased residential densities if developer will include affordable housing options.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Transfer of Development Rights | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|

Example: transfer development rights to areas where development is wanted and to restrict it in areas where it is not.

| | | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Planned Unit Development (PUD) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|

Example: allows for creative and innovative design at same time creating amenities for public benefit (mixed use development).

| | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| Development Agreements | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> N/A |
|------------------------|------------------------------|--|------------------------------|

Example: contract between municipality and developer. Municipality specifies what the developer may do and what they are required to do within project area.

Do you currently implement any of the following?

| | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| Economic Development Plan | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Development Impact Fees | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Local Option Tax (resort) | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Toll roads | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Distance Based Impact Fees | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| Tree City USA | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |

COMMUNITY DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Instructions: Complete the un-shaded areas using census data for the city/county applicant. The census data can be located on our Website at <http://community.idaho.gov>.

Name of Applicant: City of Kooskia

| | TOTALS |
|---|--------|
| TOTAL POPULATION BENEFITED (if different from city/county population in census) | |
| TOTAL POPULATION IN APPLICANT'S AREA | 675 |
| Total Male | 340 |
| Total Female | 335 |
| Total White | 629 |
| Percent of White Population | 93.2 |
| MINORITY POPULATION | |
| Black/African American | 0 |
| American Indian/Native Alaskan | 15 |
| Asian | 2 |
| Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander | 0 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native and White* | --- |
| Black/African American and White* | --- |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native and Black/African American* | --- |
| Some Other Race | 11 |
| Two or More Races | 18 |
| Hispanic | 16 |
| TOTAL MINORITY POPULATION | 62 |
| Percent of Population | 9.2 |
| SENIOR CITIZENS | |
| Total Persons 65 Years and Over | 130 |
| Percent of Minority Population | 47.6 |
| DISABILITY STATUS | |
| Civilian Non-institutionalized Population 16 to 64 * | --- |
| Percent with a Work Disability * | --- |
| Civilian Non-institutionalized Population 65 Years and Over * | --- |
| Percent with a Disability | 34.2 |
| FEMALE HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD | |
| Total Households | 332 |
| Female Householder, No Husband Present | 154 |
| Percent of Total Households | 46.3 |

* = Information not available.

REVIEW AND RANKING NARRATIVE

I. Program Impact: A-D is based upon information provided in Chapter 5 (no action required). Staff will calculate the points.

E. Eligible Activity Priority Ranking Sheet:

Fill in the percentage of the project's budget that will be spent on the following activities. The Total Points Awarded column will be completed by department staff.

| ELIGIBLE ACTIVITY | POINTS POSSIBLE | PERCENTAGE OF ICDBG BUDGET SPENT ON ACTIVITY | STAFF POINTS AWARDED |
|---|-----------------|--|----------------------|
| Acquisition of Real Property | 100 | | |
| Acquisition of Real Property for Housing Projects | 50 | | |
| Public Facilities and Improvements – Health and Safety Related | 100 | 55.9% | |
| Public Facilities and Improvements – Housing Related | 75 | | |
| Public Facilities and Improvements – Social Service Related | 50 | | |
| Engineering – Architectural | 100 | 36.7% | |
| Code Enforcement | 50 | | |
| Clearance and Demolition | 10 | | |
| Removal of Architectural Barriers | 50 | | |
| Rental Income Payments | 0 | | |
| Disposition of Property | 10 | | |
| Public Services | 0 | | |
| Completion of Urban Renewal Projects | 0 | | |
| Relocation Payments | 25 | | |
| Planning Activities | 0 | | |
| Administration Activities | 100 | 07.4% | |
| Grants to Non-Profit Community Organizations | 0 | | |
| Grants to Non-Profit Community Organizations for Housing Projects | 75 | | |
| Energy Planning | 0 | | |
| Housing Rehabilitation | 75 | | |
| Total Points Awarded to Project | | | |

II. **National Objectives:** Complete the need and impact for the project type that is Public Facilities.

Per the 2000 Census, Kooskia is 64% LMI

A. Low and Moderate Income (LMI):

1. The City of Kooskia, per the 2000 census, is able to document 64% LMI. The water system improvements project for the City will directly serve the 675 people of the City.
2. Need and Impact:

Critical Need:

The critical need of the project exists because the City has concerns about the adequacy of the existing water system to meet the existing and future needs of the City. The current source and storage for the City is very good, however, some water mains need to be replaced to eliminate numerous water leaks (6 leaks already within the first part of this year), old, undersized metal and asbestos pipe. In addition there are some areas of the water main system that are not looped and do not allow fire flow protection in areas of town, which does not provide system flexibility or sufficient water quality in dead-end water main lines and leaky deteriorating steel mains. There are also some portions of the City that do not have adequate fire hydrant coverage that causes great concern during fire season. Finally, the rotten egg smell needs to be eliminated by the proposed tank aeration system.

Currently the City cannot provide adequate fire flow and fire hydrant coverage

Currently the City is experiencing significant water leaks due to the old, undersized metal and asbestos pipe

Regulation Violation:

The City is thankfully not under any regulation violation because the City has been extremely proactive in their system maintenance. However, the water main repairs that need to be completed are not within the City's capacity to replace. This means that the hazardous materials from old pipe is still going to be in the ground, which will lead to future violations.

The City's system is not currently providing adequate fire flow coverage and fire hydrant coverage, which again thankfully has not been listed as a violation. However, the lack of coverage could lead to future violations, fire catastrophe and significant economic loss. Case in point, currently McFarland Pole Company employs 7 people, and is connected to the City's system with a 4-inch line (not to code), on a 2-inch service connection, on a dead-end water main with no fire flow protection --- NOT GOOD!

Currently McFarland Pole Co., which employs 7 people, is connected to the City's system with a 4-inch line (not to code), on a 2-inch service connection, on a dead-end water main with no fire flow protection --- NOT GOOD!

The City realizes that without violation orders, there could be loss of the grant. Please do not penalize the City for being proactive in their

community and wanting to eliminate water problems before violations and/or catastrophes happen.

How Condition Came About:

Distribution System:

The condition came about the water main identified in the proposed project was constructed in the 1920's. In other words, the piping is old and is constructed of hazardous materials. In addition, when the system was constructed, it was constructed with piping that provided limited flexibility since there was and is no system looping. Also, the system was constructed with sparse valving, that further limits flexibility, and the undersized pipe that is currently not to code.

Fire Protection:

What Has the City Done in the Past Years to Address the Condition:

The City has completed the following over the past years:

| DATE | DESCRIPTION |
|---------|--|
| 1981 | New roofs installed on each of the 44,000 gallon water tanks |
| 1989 | \$925,000 water project consisted of 360,000 gallon reservoir was built, 330 new water meters and 18 new fire hydrants were installed, 2.8 miles of water mains were replaced as well as some services |
| 1993 | 2,200 feet of 6" water main and 22 services were replaced |
| 1995 | \$110,000 water project consisted of new well, well house, water main extension |
| 1996 | Rehabilitated Well #3 |
| 1997 | \$20,000 water project consisted of replacing 8 old fire hydrants |
| 1999 | Installed new backup generator (\$5,000) on water system |
| 2000 | Main Street project consisted of replacing and looping water lines in downtown area: 2,000 feet of 6" water main and replaced 60 services |
| 2002 | Hired consultant to complete Water System Study, including an accurate map of the distribution system |
| 2003 | \$262,000 water project consisted of new water line to school: 10" main approximately 1 miles, 8 new fire hydrants, 4 large services |
| 2006 | Replaced 1,000 feet of water line to wastewater treatment plant |
| 2006 | Completed water system Vulnerability Assessment |
| 2007 | Completed Water System Study (paid for by City) |
| 2008 | Passed bond for proposed water system project improvements |
| 2008 | Hired consultant to complete Environmental Report for proposed water system project (paid for by City) |
| Various | Replaced 6 old fire hydrants |

Impact:

Benefits Received for LMI Persons from this Project:

- Proactive behavior by the City to not let the system get to DEQ violation status.
- Good, consistent source of quality water.
- Removal of undersized pipe.
- Elimination of rotten egg smell at water storage tank.
- Provide distribution system flexibility with looped system and additional valving for maintenance.
- Complete fire flow and fire hydrant coverage for entire City.

Ramifications if the Project is not Funded:

- DEQ violations could become reality.
- Resident complaints of rotten egg smell would continue.
- City's water would continue to flow through the undersized pipes.
- City would continue to have a non-looped system, nonflexible system.
- Distribution system would still be undersized and not to code.
- Entire City would not have adequate fire flow and/or fire hydrant coverage.

Components to be Cut if the Project Comes in Over Budget:

Improvements listed in the Water Study identify improvements, numbered from 1 to 11 (See Attachment G), are listed in priority order. The improvements that would be cut if the project comes in over budget would start with priority listed on the right side of the page of Table 12 from the Water Study. Priorities are listed from left to right, left being most important, right being least important. The City, with their consultant, would work backwards towards improvement priority listed on the left of Table 12 (see Attachment G) until the project was within budget.

Improvements Grantee Will Do if Components are Cut:

First of all, we do not anticipate any budget overruns. The consultant the City of Kooskia is working with, Progressive Engineering Group, has a great track record of keeping projects within budget. However, if unanticipated costs occur, the City has passed a bond for more funds than is projected to be needed for the improvements. In addition, the City may decide to complete the cut project components on their own.

Procedures that Will be Developed to Measure Short-Term and Long-Term Permanent Impacts of the Project:

| SHORT-TERM IMPACTS | LONG-TERM IMPACTS |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Completion of Water Study with City cash▪ Completion of City's record drawing documenting existing distribution system (pipe sizes, materials, valve locations, fire hydrants)▪ Passage of \$425,000 bond▪ Completion Environmental Report with City cash | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Fire flow and fire hydrant coverage of the entire City due to the installation of additional fire hydrants, increasing pipe sizes, and looping system▪ Reliable and sustainable quality of water by removing dead-end water mains▪ Replacement of undersized pipe with new piping sized to code |

III. Project Categories:

A. Planning, Previous Actions and Schedule:

1. Design Professional:

The City of Kooskia has completed procurement, according to ICDBG rules, for engineering services and has a Contract with Progressive Engineering Group. For procurement documentation, see Attachment D.

2. Grant Administration:

The City of Kooskia has completed procurement, according to ICDBG rules, for grant administration services and has a Contract with Progressive Engineering Group. For procurement documentation, see Attachment D.

3. Plans or Studies:

The City of Kooskia completed a Water System Study in September 2007, which was approved by DEQ in January 2008. See Attachment G for Water Study Excerpts and DEQ Approval of the Water Study.

The Study included the following components: 1) introduction, summary and recommendations; 2) general information – location and topography, climate, vegetation and wildlife, soils, surface water, transportation, power, and communication, business and industry, assessed property valuations, outstanding bonded indebtedness, surplus and reserve funds; 3) service area and population information – service area boundaries, population, population served; 4) existing water system – existing water rates, water supply, water quality, water storage, distribution system, water production, water consumption, water system losses, water rights; 5) analysis of water system – fire flow requirements, analysis of existing water supply, analysis of future water supply, storage tank, analysis of water distribution system, fire hydrant coverage; 6) estimated costs of proposed improvements – replacement or construction of new water mains, summary of estimated costs of proposed improvements; 7) suggested methods of paying for proposed improvements; 8) figures – vicinity map, existing distribution system, existing fire hydrant coverage, water use peaking factors, 2003 through 2006, proposed new fire hydrant coverage; 9) tables – average high temperature, average low temperature, soil description of the Kooskia area, City of Kooskia largest employers, population history, population projections, water system losses, NBFU recommended fire flows, peak factors, equalization storage for existing conditions, equalization storage for future conditions, financial breakdown; and 10) appendices – well driller logs, drinking water protection plan, drinking water reports, vulnerability assessment, leak survey conclusion, water rights, WaterCAD model fire flow report, proposed improvements schematics, State Fire Marshal memorandum.

4. Environmental Scoping:

The City of Kooskia completed an Environmental Report for Rural Development funding, which was identified as a Categorical Exclusion. The Environmental Report is expected to be adopted by ICDBG staff in January 2009. See Attachment H for Environmental Documentation.

5. Agency Viability:

a. (1) Utility Rate Review – Rural Development completed a utility rate review as part of their review of the Water System Study. Based on the estimated costs of the proposed improvements and different funding scenarios in the Water Study, and working with Progressive Engineering Group, Rural Development estimated that the monthly user rate will need to be increased \$7 to \$10.

a. (2) See pages 16-18 for the completed Financial Profile of the City of Kooskia.

6. Property Acquisition:

The project will not involve any acquisition. All project improvements will take place in existing right-of-way.

7. Funding Commitments:

100% of match funds are committed to this project. Please see Attachments B and C for matching fund commitment letters.

8. Schedule:

Please see the schedule on page 15.

9. Administrative Capacity:

- a. See narrative on page 5 that establishes the City's administrative capacity.
- b. The City has completed Section 504/ADA Self Evaluation and Transition Plan through previous projects. Please see Attachment F for ADA Documentation.
- c. The City has adopted a Fair Housing Resolution and completed a Fair Housing Plan through previous projects. For resolution documentation, publications, and Fair Housing Plan, see Attachment F.

B. Cost Analysis:

See page 14 for the Detailed Cost Analysis.

CERTIFICATIONS

I certify the data in this application is true and correct, that this document has been duly authorized by the governing body of the City of Kooskia and we will comply with the following laws and regulations if this application is approved and selected for funding.

- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
- Civil Rights Act of 1964 Pub.L 88-352
- Civil Rights Act of 1968 Pub.L 90-284
- Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- Rehabilitation Act of 1973, Section 504
- Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended (49 CFR Part 24)
- Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended Pub.L 93-383
- Davis-Bacon Act (40 USC 276a - 276a-5)
- Historic Preservation Act
- OMB Circular A-87, and ensure that sub-recipient complies with A-110 and A-122
- Section 106 of the Housing and Urban Recovery Act of 1983 certifying to:
 - Minimize displacement as a result of activities assisted with CDBG funds by following the Idaho Department of Commerce & Labors anti-displacement and relocation assistance plan;
 - Conduct and administer its program in conformance with Title VI and Title VIII, and affirmatively further fair housing;
 - Provide opportunities for citizen participation comparable to the state's requirements (those described in Section 104(a) of the Act, as amended);
 - Not use assessments or fees to recover the capital costs of ICDBG funded public improvements from low and moderate income owner occupants;
 - Abide by all state and federal rules and regulations related to the implementation and management of federal grants;
 - Assess and implement an Accessibility Plan for persons with disabilities in accordance with Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended;
 - Adopt and implement an Excessive Force Policy;
 - Prohibition of Use of Assistance for Employment Relocation, Section 588 of the Disability Housing and work Responsibility Act of 1998 Pub. L 105-276.
 - Anti-Lobbying Certification: No federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid, by or on behalf of the undersigned to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, a member of, employee of a member of, officer of or employee of Congress in connection with the awarding of any federal contract, the making of any federal grant or loan, the entering into any cooperative agreement and the extension, renewal, modification or amendment of any federal contract, grant, loan or cooperative agreement.

If any funds other than federal appropriated funds have been paid or will be paid to any person for influencing or attempting to influence an officer or employee of any federal agency, a member of, employee of a member of, officer of or employee of Congress in connection with this federal grant, the undersigned shall complete and submit Standard Form-LLL, "Disclosure Form to Report Lobbying," in accordance with its instructions.

Signed by Chief Elected Official

November 12, 2008
Date

Charlotte Schilling, Mayor
Typed Name

ICDBG ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING – FIELD NOTES CHECKLIST

Applicant: City of Kooskia Sub Recipient: Not Applicable

This site and desk review checklist is to be completed by the Applicant and submitted with the application.

The purpose of the checklist is to help the Applicant and ICL better understand what environmental statutes or provisions per 24 CFR 58 might impact the proposed project. The information will assist in understanding what studies, documentation, and mitigation measures could be applicable and to assist in completing the environmental review record. The Applicant may choose to attach this scoping checklist as part of the environmental review record.

1. Limitations on Activities

Is the Grantee planning or in the process of acquiring property for this proposed project? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, is the Applicant aware that land acquired or site work after submission of the ICDBG application is subject to 24 CFR 58.22 Limitation on Activities Requiring Clearance? Meaning once an application for ICDBG funds is submitted, neither Applicant or sub recipient, may commit Non-HUD funds to a project for land acquisition or site work (except for minor testing) before the environmental review is complete, unless the land acquisition or contract is conditioned on completion of the ICDBG environmental review.

2. Historic Preservation

Has the SHPO or THPO been notified of the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

Have tribes with possible cultural and religious sites been notified of the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

3. Floodplain Management

Is the project located within a floodway or floodplain designated on a current FEMA map? Check Web site <http://store.msc.fema.gov/> ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not Sure

If yes what is the floodplain map number? 160070 0001 B

If the project is located in a floodway or floodplain is the community where the project is taking place a participant in the National Flood Insurance Program. Check Web site www.idwr.idaho.gov/water/flood
☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

4. Wetland Protection

Are there ponds, marshes, bogs, swamps, drainage ways, streams, rivers, or other wetlands on or near the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has the Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) been notified? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Has the Corps indicated what permit level will be required? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

5. Sole Source Aquifers (Clean Water Act)

Is the proposed project located over an EPA designated aquifer area? ☐ Yes ☒ No

(check website www.epa.gov/safewater/ssanp.html)

Is it known at this time if construction will disturb more than one acre of land? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has a general permit for storm water discharges from construction sites been applied for from the EPA? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

6. Endangered Species Act

Has U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, NOAA Fisheries, and Idaho Fish and Game Regional Office been notified about the project? ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

7. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

Is the project located within one mile of a designated wild and scenic river? Idaho wild and scenic rivers include portions of the St. Joe, Lochsa, Selway, Middle Fork of the Clearwater, Snake, Rapid, and Middle Fork of the Salmon. Check Web site www.nps.gov/rivers/ ☒ Yes ☐ No

8. Clean Air Act

Is the project located in a designated non-attainment area for criteria air pollutants? ☐ Yes ☒ No

For building demolition or improvements has an asbestos analysis been planned for or conducted? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

For housing rehabilitation has a lead based paint assessment been planned for or conducted? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

9. Farmland Protection Policy Act

Is the project located on a site currently zoned as residential, commercial, and/or industrial ? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Is the project area currently being utilized for farm or agricultural purposes ? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, has the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service or local planning department been notified about the project? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

10. Environmental Justice

Does project have a disproportionate environmental impact on low income or minority populations? ☒ Yes ☐ No

11. Noise Abatement and Control

Is the project new construction or rehabilitation of noise sensitive use (i.e. housing, mobile home parks, nursing homes, hospitals, and other uses where quiet is integral to the project functions)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes is the project located within 5 miles of an airport, 1000 feet of a major highway or busy road, or 3,000 feet of a railroad. ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

12. Explosive and Flammable Operations

Is the physical structure (not necessarily infrastructure) intended for residential, institutional, recreational, commercial or industrial use? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, are there any above ground explosives, flammable fuels or chemical containers within one mile of the physical structure? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

If yes, have you been able to identify what the container is holding and the container's size? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

13. Toxic Chemicals and Radioactive Materials

Are there any known hazardous materials, contamination, chemicals, gases, and radioactive substance on or near the site? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain Not Applicable

During the visual inspection of the site is there signs of distressed vegetation, vents or fill pipes, storage/oil tanks, stained soil, dumped material, questionable containers, foul or noxious odors, etc.

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, explain Not Applicable

At this time is the site's previous uses known to have been gasoline stations, train depots, dry cleaners, agricultural operations, repair shops, landfill, etc.? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Are other funding agencies requiring the Grantee to perform an American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM) environmental assessment? ASTM assessment involves analysis of site uses and ownership, inspection of site, and possible testing. ☐ Yes ☒ No

14. Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones

Is the project located within a designated airport runway clear zone or protection zone? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Does the project involve acquisition of land or construction/rehabilitation of building or infrastructure in an airport runway clear zone or protection zone? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, is the grantee aware that the airport operator may wish to purchase the property at some point in the future as part of a clear or accident zone acquisition program? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

15. Energy Efficient Designs

For building construction has the owner investigated possible incentives from power providers, such as Idaho Power, Avista, or Utah Power for incorporating energy efficient design into their building?

☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

16. Other Environmental Reviews

Have facilities studies or other environmentally related site reviews been conducted or in the process of being conducted? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, are there any identified concerns or recommended mitigation measures? ☐ Yes ☒ No

List if known - Project has been determined to a Categorical Exclusion project, converted to Exempt.

17. Information Letters

The advanced mailing of environmental information letters is sought in an effort to minimize the project's timeline in waiting for necessary documentation or information. It will assist in earlier responses to required mitigation measures should the proposed project receive grant funding.

Check the agencies that have been mailed an environmental information letter.

- ☐ Idaho State Historic Preservation Officer
- ☒ Tribal Historic Preservation Officer or Tribal Office
- ☒ Idaho Department of Water Resources
- ☐ Army Corps of Engineers (if wetlands are applicable)
- ☒ U.S. Fish and Wildlife
- ☐ NOAA Fisheries (if salmon and/or steelhead are applicable)
- ☒ Idaho Fish and Game
- ☐ USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (if farmlands are applicable)
- ☒ Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
- ☒ Local Government – Planning Department (CEDA)
- ☒ Others: Idaho County Commissioners, Idaho Department of
Commerce, City of Kooskia

Completion of the scoping checklist does not constitute that all environmental provisions or clauses related to 24 CFR 58 Environmental Reviews have been met or are known at this time.

Progressive Engineering Group, Inc.
Completed By

November 12, 2008
Date